

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/550,224	05/02/2006	Satoshi Miyata	KOD182B.001APC	7803		
20995 KNOBBE MA	7590 05/14/200 RTENS OLSON & BE	EXAM	EXAMINER			
2040 MAIN STREET			EBRAHIM, NABILA G			
FOURTEENT IRVINE, CA 9		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
,,	it it al, or sale			1618		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			05/14/2009	ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com eOAPilot@kmob.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/550,224	MIYATA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Nabila G. Ebrahim	1618		

	Nabila G. Ebrahim	1618			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 16 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.			
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A on event, however, will the statutory priorid for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (8) of MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION, See MPEP 706 07	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period even under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of thortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as		
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the			
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);			
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.			
The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).					
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).		
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but 		•			
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (Other:		Condition for allowan	te because.		
/Michael G. Hartley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618	/Nabila G Ebrahim/ Examiner, Art Unit 1618				

Applicant argues that claim 1 requires a topical composition comprises 0.7% to 2.0% of silymarin dissolved in dipropylene glycol. Applicant shows three tables from the instant specification showing the results produced by the use of silymarin in protogo collagen and elastin. However, it is noted that Hartalake teaches the use of Silybum marianum in an amount of preferable 0.0001-2.0 wt%, which is expected inherently to have the same effects and results. It is also noted that the tables showed by Applicant do not comprise the use of dipropylene glycol. Applicant also argues that Hartalake's composition enhances epidermal permeation barrier functions and is not expected to increase skin permeability. To respond to this argument, it is expected that same compositions have the same properties and it should have the same results obtained by using the instant composition. Applicant argues that Candau is for coloning the skin and contains a radiation-screening agent and thus it is not expected to penetrate the skin. To respond: it is the position of the Examiner that the dipropylene glool used by Candau is the same compound and should have the same properties and effects. Applicant argues that Hartake does not use a solvent while Candau used dipropylene glycol as a solvent. Thus there is no motivation or reason to use the dipropylene glycol work in the compound is known to people of ordinary skill in the art having different other uses such as skin penetration (see for example US 5780049) and as a diluent for fragrances. Applicant argues regarding claim 17 that Benaiges does not teach or suggest that 0.7% to 2.0% silymarin dissolved in dipropylene glycol. The compound is shown to people of ordinary skill in the art having different other uses such as skin penetration (see for example US 5780049) and as a diluent for fragrances. Applicant argues regarding claim 17 that Benaiges does not teach or suggest that 0.7% to 2.0% silymarin dissolved in dipropylene glycol. The compound is shown to people of ordinary skill mit ma